arXiv:1404.1629v2 [math.AP] 19 Apr 2014

TO THE THEORY OF VISCOSITY SOLUTIONS FOR UNIFORMLY ELLIPTIC ISAACS EQUATIONS

N.V. KRYLOV

ABSTRACT. We show how a theorem about the solvability in $C^{1,1}$ of special Isaacs equations can be used to obtain existence and uniqueness of viscosity solutions of general uniformly nondegenerate Isaacs equations. We apply it also to establish the $C^{1+\chi}$ regularity of viscosity solutions and show that finite-difference approximations have an algebraic rate of convergence. The main coefficients of the Isaacs equations are supposed to be in C^{γ} with γ slightly less than $1/2$.

1. INTRODUCTION

The goal of this article is to present a purely PDE exposition of some major results in the theory of viscosity solutions for uniformly nondegenerate Isaacs equations.

Let $\mathbb{R}^d = \{x = (x^1, ..., x^d)\}$ be a d-dimensional Euclidean space. Assume that we are given separable metric spaces A and B, and let, for $(\alpha, \beta, x) \in A \times B \times \mathbb{R}^d$, the following functions be given:

(i) $d \times d$ matrix-valued $a^{\alpha\beta}(x)$,

(ii) $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued $b^{\alpha\beta}(x)$, and

(iii) real-valued functions $c^{\alpha\beta}(x) \geq 0$, $f^{\alpha\beta}(x)$, and $g(x)$.

Let $\mathbb{S}$ be the set of symmetric $d \times d$ matrices, and for $(u_{ij}) \in \mathbb{S}$, $(u_i) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $u \in \mathbb{R}$ introduce

$$F(u_{ij}, u_i, u, x) = \sup_{\alpha \in A} \inf_{\beta \in B} [a_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}(x) u_{ij} + b_i^{\alpha\beta}(x) u_i - c^{\alpha\beta}(x) u],$$

where and everywhere below the summation convention is enforced and the summations are done inside the brackets.

For a sufficiently smooth function $u = u(x)$ also introduce

$$L^{\alpha\beta} u(x) = a_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}(x) D_{ij} u(x) + b_i^{\alpha\beta}(x) D_i u(x) - c^{\alpha\beta}(x) u(x),$$

where, naturally, $D_i = \partial / \partial x^i$, $D_{ij} = D_i D_j$. Denote

$$F[u](x) = F(D_{ij} u(x), D_i u(x), u(x), x) = \sup_{\alpha \in A} \inf_{\beta \in B} [L^{\alpha\beta} u(x) + f^{\alpha\beta}(x)]. \quad (1.1)$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35D40, 35J60, 49N70, 39A14.

Key words and phrases. Fully nonlinear equations, viscosity solutions, Hölder regularity of derivatives, finite-difference approximations.

The author was partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-1160569.

Also fix a sufficiently regular domain $G \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Under appropriate assumptions which we list in Section 2 and which include the boundedness and continuity with respect to x of the data and uniform nondegeneracy of $a^{\alpha\beta}(x)$ the Isaacs equation

$$F[u] = 0 \tag{1.2}$$

in G with boundary condition $u = g$ on ∂G has a viscosity solution $w \in C(\bar{G})$. Recall (see [4]) that this means that for any smooth $\phi(x)$ and any point $x_0 \in G$ at which $\phi - w$ attains

(i) a local maximum which is zero we have $F[\phi](x_0) \leq 0$,

(ii) a local minimum which is zero we have $F[\phi](x_0) \geq 0$.

We are going to discuss the existence, uniqueness, regularity properties of w, and the rate of convergence of finite-difference approximations to w and, therefore, we give a brief account of basic facts known for the Isaacs equations. We only discuss these equations although in the references below more general equations are considered and more details can be found. For brevity, when we mention that, say, a is uniformly continuous in x, we mean uniformity with respect to α, β, x. The Lipschitz or Hölder continuity also presume that the corresponding constants are independent of α, β.

In 1989 Ishii [6] proved the existence of viscosity solutions for possibly degenerate equations with Lipschitz continuous a and b and uniformly continuous c and f with respect to x under the condition that for a constant $\delta > 0$

$$c^{\alpha\beta} \geq \delta. \tag{1.3}$$

In the same year 1989 Trudinger [21] (see Corollary 3.4 there, also see [20]) proved the existence (for uniformly nondegenerate case) dropping (1.3) and reducing the Lipschitz continuity of a to the $1/2 - \varepsilon$-Hölder continuity and assuming that b, c, f are uniformly continuous with respect to x. In [21] the methods of the theory of viscosity solutions are combined with the classical PDE methods.

Crandall, Ishii, and Lions in their user's guide [4] in 1992 based their existence results on the comparison principle in the same way as it was done in [6] and one can extract from [4] an existence result (unfortunately not stated explicitly) in the uniformly nondegenerate case under, basically, the same assumptions as in [6] but dropping (1.3).

Jensen and Święch [9] in 2005 proved that even if a, b, c, f are just measurable, there exists a continuous L_p-viscosity solutions, which in case that a, b, c, f are uniformly continuous with respect to x is automatically just a classical viscosity solution. To the best of the author's knowledge, this provides the most general conditions to date for existence of classical viscosity solutions (their solution in case of continuous a is actually in $C^{1+\chi}$ which is proved in Święch [19] (1997) and can be obtained from an elliptic counterpart of [14]). For further information concerning L_p-viscosity solutions we refer the reader to [2] and [5]

Next issue is uniqueness. Here the starting assumption is that the coefficients and f are uniformly continuous in x. Jensen [8] in 1988 proved a comparison principle (and hence uniqueness) for *Lipschitz* continuous viscosity solutions to the fully nonlinear second order elliptic PDE not explicitly depending on x and not necessarily connected with the Isaacs equations. Ishii in [6] showed among other things that the Lipschitz continuity of solutions is not necessary and one can treat equations with F explicitly depending on x. The equations in [6] could degenerate and therefore condition (1.3) is imposed. Ishii and Lions [7] (1990) prove uniqueness when a is $1/2+\varepsilon$-Hölder continuous. Even though the equations in [7] are uniformly nondegenerate condition (1.3) is imposed.

Trudinger [21] (1989) shows that if a is Hölder continuous, then any continuous viscosity solution is Lipschitz continuous and then uniqueness (but not existence) follows from his result in [20] (1988) if a is $1/2-\varepsilon$-Hölder continuous (see Remark 3.1 in [20]). To the best of the author's knowledge, this is the most general result concerning the uniqueness of classical viscosity solutions.

Crandall, Ishii, and Lions [4] stated and proved the comparison result under, basically, the same assumptions as in [6], and then made a few comments about the possibility to drop (1.3) and prove the comparison result for subsolutions and supersolutions in class $C^{1+\chi}$. These comments will be instrumental in our exposition.

Jensen and Święch [9] proved uniqueness of continuous L_p-viscosity solutions, allowing $1/2-\varepsilon$-Hölder continuous a and only measurable b, c, f. Again, if b, c, f are uniformly continuous in x, this yields the uniqueness of classical viscosity solutions, previously obtained in [21].

Next issue is about the regularity of viscosity solutions: given a continuous viscosity solution w, is it true that $w \in C^{\chi}$ or $C^{1+\chi}$?

Caffarelli [1] (1989) and Trudinger [20], [21] were the first authors who proved $C^{1+\chi}$ regularity for fully nonlinear elliptic equations of type

$$F[u] = f \tag{1.4}$$

without convexity assumptions on F. The assumptions in these papers are different. We keep concentrating on the Isaacs equations and compare the assumptions only in that case. In [1] the function $F(u_{ij}, u_i, u, x)$ is independent of u_i, u and, for each u_{ij}, is uniformly sufficiently close to a function which is continuous with respect to x. In [20] and [21] the function F depends on all arguments but is Hölder continuous in x. Next step in what concerns $C^{1+\chi}$-estimates was done by Święch [19] (1997), who considered general F and imposed the same condition as in [1] on the x-dependence, which is much weaker than in [20] and [21] (but also imposed the Lipschitz condition on the dependence of F on u_i, u for F more general than coming from the Isaacs equations, whereas in [20] and [21] only the continuity with respect to u_i is assumed). It is worth emphasizing that these results are

about *any* continuous viscosity solution. The existence of a viscosity solution of class $C^{1+\chi}$ follows from [9], [19] and also can be obtained from an elliptic counterpart of [14].

Finally, a few words about the rate of convergence of numerical approximation of solutions of the Isaacs equations. Caffarelli and Souganidis in [3] proved that there is an algebraic rate of convergence of solutions of finite-difference schemes to the Lipschitz continuous viscosity solution of the fully nonlinear elliptic equation (1.4) with F not necessarily connected with the Isaacs equations in a regular domain with Dirichlet boundary data. They assumed that F depends only on u_{ij}. This was the first result available for fully nonlinear elliptic equations without convexity assumptions on F. Naturally, one would want to extend the result to the F's depending also on Du, u, and x. Turanova [22] extended the results of [3] to F's explicitly depending on x, but still independent of u_i, u and, in case of Isaacs equations, with Lipschitz continuous a and f. This result was generalized in [15] for equations with Lipschitz continuous a and b and Hölder continuous c and f.

In this paper we further generalize the result of [15] in the case of $1/2-\varepsilon$-Hölder continuous a and Hölder continuous b, c, f. This is done by using special approximations of the original equation introduced in [13]. On the way we also prove the uniqueness of viscosity solutions for $1/2-\varepsilon$-Hölder continuous a and continuous c, b, f (Trudinger's result of 1989). In that case we also prove the existence of viscosity solution in class $C^{1+\chi}$. Actually, as it has been mentioned in the Abstract and in the beginning of the Introduction, the main goal of this article is to show how a theorem from [13] about the solvability in $C^{1,1}$ of special Isaacs equations can be used to obtain existence and uniqueness of viscosity solutions, their $C^{1+\chi}$ regularity, and establish a rate of convergence of numerical approximation for general uniformly nondegenerate Isaacs equations.

The methods we use are different from the methods of Trudinger and the methods of the theory of viscosity solutions. However, apart from the results of [13] and other PDE tools we also use an argument from Section V. A of [4] explaining how to prove the comparison principle for $C^{1+\chi}$ subsolutions and supersolutions. We use a quantitative version of this argument.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present our main results and prove all of them apart from Theorem 2.4 and assertion (ii) of Theorem 2.5, which are proved in Sections 4 and 5, respectively, after a rather long Section 3 containing a comparison theorem for smooth functions.

Our equation are considered in C^2 domains with $C^{1,1}$ boundary data. These restrictions can be considerably relaxed and we leave doing that to the interested reader.

2. Main result

Fix some constants $\delta \in (0,1)$ and $K_0 \in [0,\infty)$. Set

$$\mathbb{S}_\delta = \{a \in \mathbb{S} : \delta|\xi|^2 \leq a_{ij}\xi^i\xi^j \leq \delta^{-1}|\xi|^2, \quad \forall\, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d\}.$$

In the following assumption the small parameter $\chi \in (0,1)$, which depends only on δ and d, is a constant to be specified in Theorem 2.3 and

$$\gamma = \frac{4-3\chi}{8-4\chi} \quad (< 1/2). \tag{2.1}$$

Assumption 2.1. (i) The functions $a^{\alpha\beta}(x)$, $b^{\alpha\beta}(x)$, $c^{\alpha\beta}(x)$, and $f^{\alpha\beta}(x)$ are continuous with respect to $\beta \in B$ for each (α, x) and continuous with respect to $\alpha \in A$ uniformly with respect to $\beta \in B$ for each x, and

$$\|g\|_{C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \le K_0,$$

(ii) For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \in A \times B$

$$\|a^{\alpha\beta}(x)\|, |b^{\alpha\beta}(x)|, |c^{\alpha\beta}(x)|, |f^{\alpha\beta}(x)| \le K_0,$$

where for a matrix σ we denote $\|\sigma\|^2 = \operatorname{tr} \sigma\sigma^*$,

(iii) For any $(\alpha, \beta) \in A \times B$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\|a^{\alpha\beta}(x) - a^{\alpha\beta}(y)\| \le K_0 |x-y|^\gamma,$$

$$|u^{\alpha\beta}(x) - u^{\alpha\beta}(y)| \le K_0 \omega(|x-y|),$$

where $u = b, c, f$, and ω is a fixed continuous increasing function on $[0, \infty)$ such that $\omega(0) = 0$,

(iv) For all values of arguments $a^{\alpha\beta} \in \mathbb{S}_\delta$.

Remark 2.1. It is convenient to assume that

$$|x-y|^\chi \le \omega(|x-y|),$$

whenever $|x-y| \le 1$. Clearly this assumption does not restrict generality.

We will be dealing with equation (1.2) in a fixed bounded domain $G \in C^2$ with boundary condition $u = g$ on ∂G. In [13] a convex positive homogeneous of degree one Lipschitz continuous function $P(u_{ij}, u_i, u)$ is constructed on $\mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ such that at all points of differentiability of P with respect to (u_{ij}) we have

$$(P_{u_{ij}}) \in \mathbb{S}_{\hat\delta}, \quad |(P_{u_i})| \le K_1, \quad 0 > P_u \ge -K_1,$$

where $\hat\delta$ is a constant in $(0, \delta)$ depending only on d and δ and $K_1 \ge K_0$ depends only on d, K_0, and δ. This function is constructed once only d, K_0, and δ are given and possesses some additional properties to be mentioned and used below. By $P[u](x)$ we denote $P(D_{ij}u(x), D_i u(x), u(x))$.

Here is a consequence of Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 of [13].

Theorem 2.1. *For any $K \ge 0$ each of the equations*

$$\max(F[u], P[u] - K) = 0, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\min(F[v], -P[-v] + K) = 0 \tag{2.3}$$

in G with boundary condition $u = v = g$ on ∂G has a unique solution in the class $C^{1,1}_{loc}(G) \cap C(\bar G)$.

By u_K and v_K we denote the solutions of (2.2) and (2.3), respectively. These are the central objects of our investigation. Here is a simple property they possess.

Lemma 2.2. *There exists a constant N, depending only on d, δ, K_0, and G, such that in G*

$$|u_K - g| + |v_K - g| \leq N\rho, \quad |u_K| + |v_K| \leq N,$$

where $\rho(x) = \operatorname{dist}(x, G^c)$.

This result for u_K follows from the fact that $|\max(F[0], -K)| \leq |F[0]|$, $g \in C^{1,1}$, $G \in C^2$, and u_K satisfies a linear equation

$$a_{ij} D_{ij} u_K + b_i D_i u_K - c u_K + f = 0,$$

where $(a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{S}_{\hat{\delta}}$, $|(b_i)| \leq K_1$, $K_1 \geq c \geq 0$, and $|f| \leq K_0$. The case of v_K is quite similar.

To characterize some smoothness properties of u_K and v_K introduce $C^{1+\chi}(G)$ as the space of continuously differentiable functions in G with finite norm given by

$$\|u\|_{C^{1+\chi}(G)} = \sup_G |u| + \sup_{x,y \in G} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|} + [u]_{C^{1+\chi}(G)},$$

where

$$[u]_{C^{1+\chi}(G)} = \sup_{x,y \in G} \frac{|Du(x) - Du(y)|}{|x - y|^\chi}.$$

For $\varepsilon > 0$ introduce

$$G_\varepsilon = \{x \in G : \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial G) > \varepsilon\}. \tag{2.4}$$

Theorem 2.3. *There exists a constant $\chi \in (0,1)$, depending only on δ and d, and there exists a constant N, depending only on K_0, δ, d, and G, such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$ (such that $G_\varepsilon \neq \emptyset$)*

$$\|u_K, v_K\|_{C^{1+\chi}(G_\varepsilon)} \leq N \varepsilon^{-1-\chi}. \tag{2.5}$$

Proof. Denote

$$F_K[u] = \max(F[u], P[u] - K), \quad P_0(u_{ij}) = P(u_{ij}, 0, 0),$$
$$P_0[u](x) = P_0(D_{ij} u(x)),$$

take the constant N from Lemma 2.2, and for $K \geq K_1 N$ consider the *parabolic* equation

$$\partial_t u + \max(F_K[u], P_0[u] - K_1 N - K) = 0 \tag{2.6}$$

in $(0,1) \times G_{\varepsilon/2}$ with boundary condition $u = u_K$ on the parabolic boundary of $(0,1) \times G_{\varepsilon/2}$. Observe that by construction (see [13])

$$P_0(u_{ij}) \leq P(u_{ij}, u_i, 0) \leq P(u_{ij}, u_i, u) + K_1 u_+.$$

It follows that

$$P_0[u_K] - K_1 N - K \leq P[u_K] - K$$

and u_K is a solution of (2.6), which is unique by the maximum principle. Now, by Theorem 5.4 of [14]

$$[u_K]_{C^{1+\chi}(G_\varepsilon)} \leq N\varepsilon^{-1-\chi}$$

and (2.5) for u_K follows from interpolation inequalities.

The function $w = -v_K$ is a solution of the equation

$$\max(-F[-w], P[w] - K) = 0,$$

which is treated similarly to the above. Observe that in [14] the operator $F[u]$ is not necessarily given by (1.1). The theorem is proved.

The following result is central in this paper. Fix a constant $\tau \in (0,1)$.

Theorem 2.4. *For $K \to \infty$ we have $|u_K - v_K| \to 0$ uniformly in G. Moreover, if*

$$\omega(t) = t^\tau, \tag{2.7}$$

then there exist constants $\xi \in (0,1)$ depending only on τ, d, K_0, and δ and $N \in (0,\infty)$, depending only on τ, d, K_0, δ, and G, such that, if $K \geq N$, then

$$|u_K - v_K| \leq NK^{-\xi} \tag{2.8}$$

in G.

We prove Theorem 2.4 in Section 4

Theorem 2.5. *(i) The limit*

$$w := \lim_{K\to\infty} u_K$$

exists,

(ii) The function w is a unique continuous in $\bar{G}$ viscosity solution of (1.2) *with boundary condition $w = g$ on ∂G,*

(iii) If condition (2.7) *is satisfied, then for large enough K we have $|u_K - w| \leq NK^{-\xi}$,*

(iv) For any $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$ (such that $G_\varepsilon \neq \emptyset$)

$$\|w\|_{C^{1+\chi}(G_\varepsilon)} \leq N\varepsilon^{-1-\chi},$$

where N is the constant from (2.5).

Assertions (i), (iii), and (iv) are simple consequences of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 and the maximum principle. Indeed, notice that $F[u_K] \leq 0$ and $F[v_K] \geq 0$. Hence by the maximum principle $u_K \geq v_K$. Furthermore, again by the maximum principle u_K decreases and v_K increases as K increases. This takes care of assertions (i), (iii), and (iv).

Assertion (ii) is proved in Section 5.

The following result is obtained be referring to the proof of Theorem 2.1 of [15] (see Section 5 there) and using assertion (iii) of our Theorem 2.5, that was used in [15] in the case of Lipschitz continuous coefficients. To state it we introduce the necessary objects.

As is well known (see, for instance, [16]), there exists a finite set $\Lambda = \{l_1, ..., l_{d_2}\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ containing all vectors from the standard orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that one has the following representation

$$L^{\alpha\beta}u(x) = a_k^{\alpha\beta}(x)D_{l_k}^2 u(x) + \bar{b}_k^{\alpha\beta}(x)D_{l_k}u(x) - c^{\alpha\beta}(x)u(x),$$

where $D_{l_k}u(x) = \langle Du, l_k\rangle$, $a_k^{\alpha\beta}$ and $\bar{b}_k^{\alpha\beta}$ are certain bounded functions and $a_k^{\alpha\beta} \geq \delta_1$, with a constant $\delta_1 > 0$. One can even arrange for such representation to have the coefficients $a_k^{\alpha\beta}$ and $\bar{b}_k^{\alpha\beta}$ with the same regularity properties with respect to x as the original ones $a_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}$ and $b_i^{\alpha\beta}$ (see, for instance, Theorem 3.1 in [12]). Define B as the smallest closed ball containing Λ, and for $h > 0$ set $\mathbb{Z}_h^d = h\mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$G_{(h)} = G \cap \mathbb{Z}_h^d, \quad G_{(h)}^o = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}_h^d : x + hB \in G\}, \quad \partial_h G = G_{(h)} \setminus G_{(h)}^o.$$

Next, for $h > 0$ we introduce

$$\delta_{h,l_k}u(x) = \frac{u(x + hl_k) - u(x)}{h},$$

$$\Delta_{h,l_k}u(x) = \frac{u(x + hl_k) - 2u(x) + u(x - hl_k)}{h^2},$$

$$L_h^{\alpha\beta}u(x) = a_k^{\alpha\beta}(x)\Delta_{h,l_k}u(x) + \bar{b}_k^{\alpha\beta}(x)\delta_{h,l_k}u(x) - c^{\alpha\beta}(x)u(x),$$

$$F_h[u](x) = \sup_{\alpha\in A}\inf_{\beta\in B}[L_h^{\alpha\beta}u(x) + f^{\alpha\beta}(x)].$$

It is a simple fact shown, for instance, in [16] that for each sufficiently small h there exists a unique function w_h on $G_{(h)}$ such that $F_h[w_h] = 0$ on $G_{(h)}^o$ and $w_h = 0$ on $\partial_h G$.

Here is the result we were talking about above.

Theorem 2.6. *Let condition* (2.7) *be satisfied and* $g = 0$. *Then there exist constants* N *and* $\eta > 0$ *such that for all sufficiently small* $h > 0$ *we have on* $G_{(h)}$ *that*

$$|w_h - w| \leq Nh^\eta.$$

We imposed the condition $g = 0$ in order to be able to refer directly to the arguments in [15], where $g = 0$. Actually, the result of [15] can be easily extended to cover the case $g \in C^{1,1}$ (and even go much further), and then Theorem 2.6 will also cover this case.

3. An auxiliary result

In the following theorem G can be just any bounded domain.

Theorem 3.1. *Let* $u, v \in C^2(\bar{G})$ *be such that for a constant* $K \geq 1$

$$\max(F[u], P[u] - K) \geq 0 \geq \min(F[v], -P[-v] + K) \tag{3.1}$$

in G *and* $v \geq u$ *on* ∂G. *Also assume that, for a constant* $M \in [1, \infty)$,

$$\|u, v\|_{C^{1+\varkappa}(G)} \leq M. \tag{3.2}$$

Then there exist a constant $N \in (0,\infty)$, depending only on τ, the diameter of G, d, K_0, and δ, and a constant $\eta \in (0,1)$, depending only on τ, d, K_0, and δ, such that, if $K \geq NM^{1/\eta}$, then

$$u - v \leq NK^{-\chi/4} + NM\omega(M^{-1/\tau}K^{-1}) \tag{3.3}$$

in G.

Remark 3.1. Observe that for $\omega = t^\tau$ estimate (3.3) becomes $u - v \leq NK^{-\chi/4} + K^{-\tau}$.

As we have mentioned in the Introduction, to prove this theorem, we are going to adapt to our situation an argument from Section V. A of [4]. First we introduce ψ as a global barrier for G, that is $\psi \in C^2(G)$, $\psi \geq 1$,

$$a_{ij}D_{ij}\psi + b_iD_i\psi \leq -1$$

in G for any $(a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{S}_\delta, |(b_i)| \leq K_1$. Such a ψ can be found in the form $\cosh \mu R - \cosh \mu|x|$ for sufficiently large μ and R.

Then we take and fix a radially symmetric function $\zeta = \zeta(x)$ of class $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with support in $\{x : |x| < 1\}$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ we define $\zeta_\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{-d}\zeta(\varepsilon^{-1}x)$ and for locally summable $u(x)$ introduce

$$u^{(\varepsilon)}(x) = u(x) * \zeta_\varepsilon(x).$$

Recall some standard properties of these mollifiers in which no regularity properties of G are required: If $u \in C^{1+\chi}(G)$, then with a constant N depending only on d and ζ (recall that χ depends only on d and δ)

$$\varepsilon^{-1-\chi}|u - u^{(\varepsilon)}| + \varepsilon^{-\chi}|Du - Du^{(\varepsilon)}| \leq N\|u\|_{C^{1+\chi}(G)},$$

$$|u^{(\varepsilon)}| + |Du^{(\varepsilon)}| + \varepsilon^{1-\chi}|D^2u^{(\varepsilon)}| + \varepsilon^{2-\chi}|D^3u^{(\varepsilon)}| \leq N\|u\|_{C^{1+\chi}(G)} \tag{3.4}$$

in G_ε (introduced in (2.4)).

Define the functions

$$\bar{u} = u/\psi, \quad \bar{v} = v/\psi.$$

Increasing M if necessary, we may assume that (3.2) holds with $\bar{u}, \bar{v}$ in place of u, v. This increase, of course, will be affected by the diameter of G, δ, d, and K_0.

Next, take constants $\nu, \varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$, recall (2.1), introduce

$$\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0 K^{-(1-\gamma)/(2\gamma)},$$

and consider the function

$$W(x,y) = \bar{u}(x) - \bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)}(x) - [\bar{v}(y) - \bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)}(y)] - \nu K|x-y|^2$$

in $\bar{G}_\varepsilon \times \bar{G}_\varepsilon$. Denote by $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ a maximum point of W in $\bar{G}_\varepsilon \times \bar{G}_\varepsilon$. Below by N with indices or without them we denote various constants depending only on d, K_0, δ, and the diameter of G, unless specifically stated otherwise. By the way recall that χ depends only on d and δ.

Lemma 3.2. *There exist a constant $\nu \in (0,1)$, depending only on d, K_0, and δ, and a constant N such that if*

$$K \geq N\varepsilon_0^{(\chi-1)/\eta_1} M^{1/\eta_1}, \tag{3.5}$$

where $\eta_1 = 1-(1-\chi)(1-\gamma)/(2\gamma)$ (>0), and $\bar{x}, \bar{y} \in G_\varepsilon$, then

(i) We have

$$2\nu K|\bar{x}-\bar{y}| \leq NM\varepsilon^{\chi}, \quad |\bar{x}-\bar{y}| \leq \varepsilon/2, \tag{3.6}$$

(ii) For any $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$D_{ij}[\bar{u}-\bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)}](\bar{x})\xi^i\xi^j - D_{ij}[\bar{v}-\bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)}](\bar{y})\eta^i\eta^j \leq 2\nu K|\xi-\eta|^2, \tag{3.7}$$

(iii) We have

$$\sup_{\alpha\in A}\inf_{\beta\in B}\left[\hat{a}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}D_{ij}\bar{u} + \hat{b}_i^{\alpha\beta}D_i\bar{u} - \hat{c}^{\alpha\beta}\bar{u} + f^{\alpha\beta}\right](\bar{x}) \geq 0, \tag{3.8}$$

$$\sup_{\alpha\in A}\inf_{\beta\in B}\left[\hat{a}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}D_{ij}\bar{v} + \hat{b}_i^{\alpha\beta}D_i\bar{v} - \hat{c}^{\alpha\beta}\bar{v} + f^{\alpha\beta}\right](\bar{y}) \leq 0. \tag{3.9}$$

where

$$\hat{a}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} = \psi a_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}, \quad \hat{b}_i^{\alpha\beta} = b_i^{\alpha\beta}\psi + 2a_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}D_j\psi, \quad \hat{c}^{\alpha\beta} = -L^{\alpha\beta}\psi.$$

Proof. The first inequality in (3.6) follows from the fact that the first derivatives of W with respect to x vanish at $\bar{x}$, that is $D(\bar{u}-\bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)})(\bar{x}) = 2\nu K(\bar{x}-\bar{y})$. Also the matrix of second-order derivatives of W is nonpositive at $(\bar{x},\bar{y})$, which yields (ii).

By taking $\eta = 0$ in (3.7) and using the fact that $|D^2\bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)}| \leq NM\varepsilon^{\chi-1}$ we see that

$$D^2\bar{u}(\bar{x}) \leq 2\nu K + NM\varepsilon^{\chi-1}.$$

Furthermore

$$D_{ij}u = \psi D_{ij}\bar{u} + (D_i\psi)D_j\bar{u} + (D_i\bar{u})D_j\psi + (D_{ij}\psi)\bar{u},$$

which implies that

$$D^2u(\bar{x}) \leq N(\nu K + M\varepsilon^{\chi-1}), \quad P[u](\bar{x}) \leq N_1(\nu K + M\varepsilon^{\chi-1}).$$

We now choose and fix ν such that

$$N_1\nu \leq 1/4, \quad . \tag{3.10}$$

As is easy to see $M\varepsilon^{\chi-1} \leq \nu K$ for K satisfying (3.5) with an appropriate N. Then we have $P[u](\bar{x}) \leq K/2 < K$, which implies that $F[u](\bar{x}) \geq 0$. We have just proved (3.8).

Moreover, not only $M\varepsilon^{\chi-1} \leq \nu K$ for K satisfying (3.5), but also $NM\varepsilon^{\chi-1} \leq \nu K$, where N is taken from (3.6), if we increase N in (3.5). This yields the second inequality in (3.6).

Similarly, (3.7) with $\xi = 0$ implies that $D^2\bar{v}(\bar{y}) \geq -2\nu K - NM\varepsilon^{\chi-1}$, and, with perhaps different N_1, that $P[-\bar{v}](\bar{y}) \leq N_1(\nu K + M\varepsilon^{\chi-1})$. By denoting by N_1 the largest of the above N_1's, defining ν by (3.10), and

taking $K \geq N\varepsilon_0^{\chi-1}M^{1/\eta_1}$ we see that $-P[-\bar{v}](\bar{y}) > -K$, $F[\bar{v}](\bar{y}) \leq 0$, and hence (3.9) holds. The lemma is proved.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Fix a (large) constant $\mu > 0$ to be specified later as a constant, depending only on d, K_0, δ, and the diameter of G, and first assume that

$$W \leq 2K^{-\chi/4} + \mu M\omega(M^{-1/\tau}K^{-1})$$

in $\bar{G}_\varepsilon \times \bar{G}_\varepsilon$. Observe that for any point $x \in G$ one can find a point $y \in G_\varepsilon$ with $|x - y| \leq \varepsilon$ and then

$$\bar{u}(x) - \bar{v}(x) \leq \bar{u}(y) - \bar{v}(y) + 2M\varepsilon \leq W(y, y) + 2M\varepsilon$$
$$\leq 2K^{-\chi/4} + \mu M\omega(M^{-1/\tau}K^{-1}) + 2M\varepsilon.$$

It follows that if

$$K \geq (NM)^{1/\eta_2}, \tag{3.11}$$

where $\eta_2 := (1-\gamma)/(2\gamma) - \chi/4$ (> 0), then (3.3) holds.

It is clear now that, to prove the theorem, it suffices to find N and μ such that the inequality

$$W(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \geq 2K^{-\chi/4} + \mu M\omega(M^{-1/\tau}K^{-1}) \tag{3.12}$$

is impossible if $K \geq NM^{1/\eta}$ with N and η as in the statement of the theorem. Of course, we will argue by contradiction and suppose that (3.12) holds.

Obviously, $W \geq -4M$ in $\bar{G}_\varepsilon \times \bar{G}_\varepsilon$ and at a maximum point $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ it holds that

$$\nu K|\bar{x} - \bar{y}|^2 \leq 8M.$$

It follows that (recall that ν is already fixed) $|\bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}) - \bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)}(\bar{y})| \leq M|\bar{x} - \bar{y}| \leq NM^{1/2}K^{-1/2}$, and we have from (3.12) that

$$\bar{u}(\bar{x}) - \bar{v}(\bar{y}) - \nu K|\bar{x} - \bar{y}|^2 \geq 2K^{-\chi/4} - NM^{1/2}K^{-1/2} + \mu M\omega(M^{-1/\tau}K^{-1}),$$
$$\bar{u}(\bar{x}) - \bar{v}(\bar{y}) - \nu K|\bar{x} - \bar{y}|^2 \geq K^{-\chi/4} + \mu M\omega(M^{-1/\tau}K^{-1}), \tag{3.13}$$

where the last inequality holds provided that

$$K \geq NM^{1/\eta_3} \tag{3.14}$$

with $\eta_3 = 1 - \chi/2 > 0$. Here if $\bar{x}$ or $\bar{y}$ are on ∂G_ε, then for appropriate $\hat{x} \in \partial G$ and $\hat{y} \in \partial G$ either

$$\bar{u}(\bar{x}) - \bar{v}(\bar{y}) \leq M\varepsilon + \bar{v}(\hat{x}) - \bar{v}(\bar{y}) \leq M(2\varepsilon + |\bar{x} - \bar{y}|)$$

or

$$\bar{u}(\bar{x}) - \bar{v}(\bar{y}) \leq \bar{u}(\bar{x}) - \bar{u}(\hat{y}) + M\varepsilon \leq M(2\varepsilon + |\bar{x} - \bar{y}|).$$

In any case

$$2\varepsilon M + NM^{1/2}(\nu K)^{-1/2} - \nu K|\bar{x} - \bar{y}|^2 \geq K^{-\chi/4},$$

which is impossible for

$$K \geq N(M^{1/\eta_2} + M^{1/\eta_3}). \tag{3.15}$$

Consequently, for such K, $(\bar{x},\bar{y}) \in G_\varepsilon \times G_\varepsilon$.

Upon combining (3.11), (3.14), (3.15), and (3.5) we conclude that there exists $N \in (0,\infty)$ and $\eta_0 \in (0,1)$ depending only on d, K_0, and δ such that, if

$$K \geq N\varepsilon_0^{(\chi-1)/\eta_0} M^{1/\eta_0}, \tag{3.16}$$

then (3.12) implies (3.13) and that $\bar{x},\bar{y} \in G_\varepsilon$, so that we can use the concussions of Lemma 3.2.

By denoting $\sigma^{\alpha\beta} = (\hat{a}^{\alpha\beta})^{1/2}$ we may write

$$\hat{a}^{\alpha\beta}_{ij}(x) = \sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{ik}\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{jk},$$

and then (3.7) for $\xi^i = \sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{ik}(\bar{x})$ and $\eta^i = \sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{ik}(\bar{y})$ implies that

$$\hat{a}^{\alpha\beta}_{ij}(\bar{x})D_{ij}\bar{u}(\bar{x}) \leq \hat{a}^{\alpha\beta}_{ij}(\bar{y})D_{ij}\bar{v}(\bar{y}) + \hat{a}^{\alpha\beta}_{ij}(\bar{x})D_{ij}\bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}) - \hat{a}^{\alpha\beta}_{ij}(\bar{y})D_{ij}\bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)}(\bar{y}) + J,$$

where

$$J := 2\nu K \sum_{i,k=1}^{d} |\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{ik}(\bar{x}) - \sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{ik}(\bar{y})|^2 \leq NK|\bar{x}-\bar{y}|^{2\gamma},$$

and the estimate of J is valid because $\hat{a}^{\alpha\beta}$ is uniformly nondegenerate and its square root possesses the same smoothness properties as $\hat{a}^{\alpha\beta}$. Also note that

$$\hat{a}^{\alpha\beta}_{ij}(\bar{x})D_{ij}\bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}) - \hat{a}^{\alpha\beta}_{ij}(\bar{y})D_{ij}\bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)}(\bar{y}) \leq [\hat{a}^{\alpha\beta}_{ij}(\bar{x}) - \hat{a}^{\alpha\beta}_{ij}(\bar{y})]D_{ij}\bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x})$$

$$+N|D^2\bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}) - D^2\bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)}(\bar{y})| \leq NM|\bar{x}-\bar{y}|^\gamma\varepsilon^{\chi-1} + NM\varepsilon^{\chi-2}|\bar{x}-\bar{y}|,$$

where the last inequality is obtained by the mean-value theorem relying on the fact that $|\bar{x}-\bar{y}| \leq \varepsilon/2$, so that the straight segment connecting these points lies inside $G_{\varepsilon/2}$. Hence, in light of (3.6) we get

$$\hat{a}^{\alpha\beta}_{ij}(\bar{x})D_{ij}\bar{u}(\bar{x}) \leq \hat{a}^{\alpha\beta}_{ij}(\bar{y})D_{ij}\bar{v}(\bar{y}) + NI, \tag{3.17}$$

where

$$I := M^{2\gamma}K^{1-2\gamma}\varepsilon^{2\gamma\chi} + M^{1+\gamma}K^{-\gamma}\varepsilon^{\gamma\chi+\chi-1} + M^2K^{-1}\varepsilon^{2\chi-2} = I_1 + I_2 + I_3.$$

It turns out that

$$I_1 = M^{2\gamma}\varepsilon_0^{2\gamma\chi}K^{-\chi/4}, \quad I_2 = M^{1+\gamma}\varepsilon_0^{\gamma\chi+\chi-1}K^{-\chi/4-\theta},$$

$$I_3 = M^2\varepsilon_0^{2\chi-2}K^{-\chi/4-2\theta},$$

where

$$\theta = (1-\gamma)(8\gamma)^{-1}\chi > 0.$$

Clearly,

$$I \leq M^2\varepsilon_0^{2\gamma\chi}K^{-\chi/4}[1 + \varepsilon_0^{-\gamma\chi+\chi-1}K^{-\theta} + \varepsilon_0^{2\chi-2-2\gamma\chi}K^{-2\theta}],$$

where the expression inside the square brackets is less than 3 provided that

$$K \geq \varepsilon_0^{(\chi-\chi\gamma-1)/\theta}, \tag{3.18}$$

which we suppose to hold below. Then in light of (3.17) we get

$$\hat{a}^{\alpha\beta}_{ij}(\bar{x})D_{ij}\bar{u}(\bar{x}) \le \hat{a}^{\alpha\beta}_{ij}(\bar{y})D_{ij}\bar{v}(\bar{y}) + NM^2\varepsilon_0^{2\gamma\chi}K^{-\chi/4}. \tag{3.19}$$

Furthermore,

$$D_i\bar{u}(\bar{x}) = 2\nu K(\bar{x}_i - \bar{y}_i) + D_i\bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}), \quad D_i\bar{v}(\bar{y}) = 2\nu K(\bar{x}_i - \bar{y}_i) + D_i\bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)}(\bar{y}),$$

and the rough estimate (see (3.6))

$$|\bar{x} - \bar{y}| \le N\varepsilon_0^{\chi}MK^{-1}$$

leads to (cf. Remark 2.1 and (3.6))

$$\hat{b}^{\alpha\beta}D_i\bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}) - \hat{b}^{\alpha\beta}D_i\bar{u}^{(\varepsilon)}(\bar{y}) \le NM\omega(|\bar{x} - \bar{y}|) \le NM\omega(N\varepsilon_0^{\chi}MK^{-1}).$$

Finally,

$$f^{\alpha\beta}(\bar{x}) \le f^{\alpha\beta}(\bar{y}) + N\omega(|\bar{x} - \bar{y}|) \le f^{\alpha\beta}(\bar{y}) + N\omega(N\varepsilon_0^{\chi}MK^{-1}),$$

$$-\bar{c}^{\alpha\beta}\bar{u}(\bar{x}) + \bar{c}^{\alpha\beta}\bar{v}(\bar{y}) = \bar{c}^{\alpha\beta}(\bar{x})[\bar{u}(\bar{x}) - \bar{v}(\bar{y})]$$

$$+\bar{v}(\bar{y})[\bar{c}^{\alpha\beta}(\bar{y}) - \bar{c}^{\alpha\beta}(\bar{x})] \le -[\bar{u}(\bar{x}) - \bar{v}(\bar{y})] + NM\omega(N\varepsilon_0^{\chi}MK^{-1}),$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $\bar{c}^{\alpha\beta} \ge 1$ and $\bar{u}(\bar{x}) - \bar{v}(\bar{y}) \ge 0$ (see (3.13)).

We infer from (3.8), (3.9), and the last estimates that

$$0 \le \sup_{\alpha\in A}\inf_{\beta\in B}\left[\hat{a}^{\alpha\beta}_{ij}D_{ij}\bar{v} + \hat{b}^{\alpha\beta}_{i}D_i\bar{v} - \hat{c}^{\alpha\beta}\bar{v} + f^{\alpha\beta}\right)(\bar{y})]$$

$$-[\bar{u}(\bar{x}) - \bar{v}(\bar{y})] + N_1M^2\varepsilon_0^{2\gamma\chi}K^{-\chi/4} + N_1M\omega(N\varepsilon_0^{\chi}MK^{-1}),$$

$$\bar{u}(\bar{x}) - \bar{v}(\bar{y}) \le N_1M^2\varepsilon_0^{2\gamma\chi}K^{-\chi/4} + N_1M\omega(N_1\varepsilon_0^{\chi}MK^{-1}).$$

We can certainly assume that $N_1 \ge 1$. Then we take $\mu = 2N_1$ and take $\kappa, \xi \in (0,1)$ and $\xi \in (0,\infty)$, depending only on τ, K_0, d, δ, and the diameter of G, such that for $\varepsilon_0 = \xi M^{-1/\kappa}$ and all $M \ge 1$ we have

$$N_1\varepsilon_0^{\chi}M \le M^{-1/\tau}, \quad N_1M^2\varepsilon_0^{2\gamma\chi} \le 1/2.$$

Then we arrive at a contradiction with (3.13) and, since now (3.18) and (3.16) are satisfied if $K \ge NM^{1/\eta}$ for appropriate η and N, the theorem is proved.

4. Proof of Theorem 2.4

Fix a sufficiently small $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $G_{\varepsilon_0} \ne \emptyset$ and for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ define

$$\xi_{\varepsilon,K} := \max(F[u_K^{(\varepsilon)}], P[u_K^{(\varepsilon)}] - K), \quad \eta_{\varepsilon,K} := \min(F[v_K^{(\varepsilon)}], -P[-v_K^{(\varepsilon)}] + K)$$

in G_{ε_0}. Since the second-order derivatives of u_K and v_K are bounded in G_{ε_0}, we have $\xi_{\varepsilon,K}, \eta_{\varepsilon,K} \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ in any $\mathcal{L}_p(G_{\varepsilon_0})$ for any K. Furthermore, $\xi_{\varepsilon,K}, \eta_{\varepsilon,K}$ are continuous. Therefore, there exist smooth functions $\bar{\xi}_{\varepsilon,K}, \bar{\eta}_{\varepsilon,K}$ such that

$$|\xi_{\varepsilon,K} - \bar{\xi}_{\varepsilon,K}| + |\eta_{\varepsilon,K} - \bar{\eta}_{\varepsilon,K}| \le \varepsilon, \quad \xi_{\varepsilon,K} \le \bar{\xi}_{\varepsilon,K}, \quad \eta_{\varepsilon,K} \le \bar{\eta}_{\varepsilon,K}$$

in G_{ε_0}.

By Safonov's theorem (see [17], [18]), for any subdomain G' of G_{ε_0} of class C^3 there exists a unique $w_{\varepsilon,K} \in C^2(\bar{G}')$ satisfying

$$\sup_{a \in \mathbb{S}_\delta, |b| \leq K_1} [a_{ij} D_{ij} w_{\varepsilon,K} + b_i D_i w_{\varepsilon,K}] = -(|\bar{\xi}_{\varepsilon,K}| + |\bar{\eta}_{\varepsilon,K}|)$$

in G' with zero boundary condition. Obviously,

$$\max(F[u_K^{(\varepsilon)} - w_{\varepsilon,K}], P[u_K^{(\varepsilon)} - w_{\varepsilon,K}] - K) \geq 0,$$

$$\min(F[v_K^{(\varepsilon)} + w_{\varepsilon,K}], -P[-v_K^{(\varepsilon)} - w_{\varepsilon,K}] + K) \leq 0$$

in G'. After setting

$$\zeta_{\varepsilon,K} = \sup_{\partial G'} (u_K^{(\varepsilon)} - v_K^{(\varepsilon)} - 2w_{\varepsilon,K})_+$$

we conclude by Theorem 3.1 applied to $u_K^{(\varepsilon)} - w_{\varepsilon,K}$ and $v_K^{(\varepsilon)} + w_{\varepsilon,K} + \zeta_{\varepsilon,K}$ in place of u and v, respectively, that there exist a constant $N \in (0, \infty)$, depending only on τ, the diameter of G, d, K_0, and δ, and a constant $\eta \in (0,1)$, depending only on τ, d, K_0, and δ, such that, if $K \geq N M_{\varepsilon,K}^{1/\eta}$, then

$$u_K^{(\varepsilon)} - v_K^{(\varepsilon)} \leq \zeta_{\varepsilon,K} + w_{\varepsilon,K} + NK^{-\chi/4} + M\omega(M^{-1/\tau}K^{-1})$$

in G', where $M_{\varepsilon,K}$ is any number satisfying

$$M_{\varepsilon,K} \geq \|u_K^{(\varepsilon)} - w_{\varepsilon,K}, v_K^{(\varepsilon)} + w_{\varepsilon,K} + \zeta_{\varepsilon,K}\|_{C^{1+\chi}(G')}.$$

First we discuss what is happening as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. By W_p^2-theory (see, for instance, [23]) $w_{\varepsilon,K} \to 0$ in any W_p^2, which by embedding theorems implies that $w_{\varepsilon,K} \to 0$ in $C^{1+\chi}(G')$. Obviously, the constants $\zeta_{\varepsilon,K}$ converge in $C^{1+\chi}(G')$ to

$$\sup_{\partial G'} (u_K - v_K)_+.$$

Now Theorem 2.3 implies that for sufficiently small ε one can take $N\varepsilon_0^{-1-\chi}$ as $M_{\varepsilon,K}$, where N depends only on d, δ, G, and K_0. Thus for sufficiently small ε, if $K \geq N\varepsilon_0^{-(1+\chi)/\eta}$, then

$$u_K^{(\varepsilon)} - v_K^{(\varepsilon)} \leq \zeta_{\varepsilon,K} + w_{\varepsilon,K} + NK^{-\chi/4} + N\varepsilon_0^{-1-\chi}\omega(\varepsilon_0^{(1+\chi)/\tau}K^{-1})$$

in G', which after letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ yields

$$u_K - v_K \leq NK^{-\chi/4} + N\varepsilon_0^{-1-\chi}\omega(\varepsilon_0^{(1+\chi)/\tau}K^{-1})$$

in G'. The arbitrariness of G' and Lemma 2.2 now allow us to conclude that for any $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, for which $G_{\varepsilon_0} \neq \emptyset$,

$$u_K - v_K \leq NK^{-\chi/4} + N\varepsilon_0^{-1-\chi}\omega(\varepsilon_0^{(1+\chi)/\tau}K^{-1}) + \sup_{G \setminus G_{\varepsilon_0}} (u_K - v_K)_+$$

$$\leq NK^{-\chi/4} + N\varepsilon_0^{-1-\chi}\omega(\varepsilon_0^{(1+\chi)/\tau}K^{-1}) + N\varepsilon_0 \tag{4.1}$$

in G provided that

$$K \geq N\varepsilon_0^{-(1+\chi)/\eta}. \tag{4.2}$$

This obviously proves the first assertion of the theorem because as is noted in the proof of Theorem 2.5 we have $v_K \le u_K$.

To prove the second assertion observe that for $\omega = t^\tau$ and $\varepsilon_0 = K^{-\eta/(1+\chi)}$ condition (4.2) becomes $K \ge N$ and (4.1) becomes

$$u_K - v_K \le NK^{-\chi/4} + NK^{-\tau} + NK^{-\eta/(1+\chi)}.$$

This yields the desired result and proves the theorem.

5. Proof of assertion (ii) of Theorem 2.5

First we show uniqueness. Let v be a continuous in $\bar{G}$ viscosity solution of $F[v] = 0$ with boundary data g. Observe that in the notation from Section 4 we have

$$F[u_K^{(\varepsilon)} + w_{\varepsilon,K} + \kappa\psi] < 0$$

in G' for any $\kappa > 0$. This and the definition of viscosity solution imply that the minimum of $u_K^{(\varepsilon)} + w_{\varepsilon,K} + \kappa\psi - v$ in $\bar{G}'$ is either positive or is attained on $\partial G'$. The same conclusion holds after letting $\varepsilon, \kappa \downarrow 0$ and replacing G' with G_{ε_0}. Hence, in G

$$u_K - v \ge -\sup_{G\setminus G_{\varepsilon_0}} |u_K - v|,$$

which after letting $\varepsilon_0 \downarrow 0$ and then $K \to \infty$ yields $v \le w$. By comparing v with v_K we get $v \ge w$, and hence uniqueness.

To prove that w is a viscosity solution we need a lemma, which is an elliptic analog of Lemma 6.1 of [14]. Introduce

$$F_0(u_{ij}, x) = F(u_{ij}, Dw(t,x), w(t,x), x).$$

Lemma 5.1. *There is a constant N depending only on d and δ such that for any ball B_r of radius r with closure in G and $\phi \in W_d^2(B_r) \cap C(\bar{B}_r)$ we have on B_r that*

$$w \le \phi + Nr\|(F_0[\phi])^+\|_{L_d(B_r)} + \max_{\partial B_r}(w-\phi)^+. \tag{5.1}$$

$$w \ge \phi - Nr\|(F_0[\phi])^-\|_{L_d(B_r)} - \max_{\partial B_r}(w-\phi)^-. \tag{5.2}$$

Proof. Observe that

$$-\max(F_0[\phi], P[\phi] - K) = \max(F_0[u_K], P[u_K] - K) - \max(F_0[\phi], P[\phi] - K)$$

$$+I_K = a_{ij}D_{ij}(u_K - \phi) + I_K,$$

where $a = (a_{ij})$ is an $\mathbb{S}_{\hat{\delta}}$-valued function and

$$I_K = \max(F[u_K], P[u_K] - K) - \max(F_0[u_K], P[u_K] - K).$$

It follows by Theorem 5.2 of [10] or Theorem 3.3.11 of [11] that

$$u_K \le \phi + \max_{\partial B_r}(u_K - \phi)^+$$

$$+Nr\|(I_K + \max(F_0[\phi], P[\phi] - K))^+\|_{L_d(B_r)}, \tag{5.3}$$

where the constant $N = N(d, \delta)$. Actually the above references only say that (5.3) holds with $N = N(r, d, \delta)$ in place of Nr. However, the way this constant depends on r is easily discovered by using dilations.

Notice that $u_K \to w$ and $Du_k \to Dw$ as $K \to \infty$ uniformly in B_r. Hence $I_K \to 0$ as $K \to \infty$ uniformly in B_r.

After that we obtain (5.1) from (5.3) by letting $K \to \infty$. In the same way (5.2) is established by considering v_K. The lemma is proved.

Now let $\phi \in C^2(G)$ and suppose that $w - \phi$ attains a local maximum at $x_0 \in G$. Without losing generality we may assume that $x_0 = 0$, $w(0) - \phi(0) = 0$. Then for all small $r > 0$ and balls B_r centered at x_0 and $\varepsilon > 0$ by applying (5.1) at the origin to $\phi(x) - \varepsilon(r^2 - |x|^2)$ in place of ϕ we get

$$\varepsilon r^2 \leq Nr \|(F_0[\phi - \varepsilon(r^2 - |\cdot|^2)])^+\|_{L_d(B_r)}.$$

It follows that

$$\sup_{B_r}[F_0[\phi - \varepsilon(r^2 - |\cdot|^2)] \geq 0,$$

and by letting first $r \downarrow 0$ and then $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ we conclude that

$$0 \leq F_0[\phi](0) = F(D_{ij}\phi(0), D_i\phi(0), \phi(0), 0),$$

where the equality follows from the fact that at 0 the derivatives of $w - \phi$ vanish. We have just proved that w is a viscosity subsolution.

Similarly by using (5.2) one proves that w is a viscosity supersolution. This proves the theorem.

References

[1] L. Caffarelli, *Interior a priori estimates for solutions of fully nonlinear equations*, Ann. Math., Vol. 130 (1989), 189-213.

[2] L. Caffarelli, M. G. Crandall, M. Kocan, and A. Święch, *On viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear equations with measurable ingredients*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., Vol. 49 (1996), No. 4, 365-398.

[3] L.A. Caffarelli and P.E. Souganidis, *A rate of convergence for monotone finite difference approximations to fully nonlinear, uniformly elliptic PDEs*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., Vol. 61 (2008), No. 1, 1–17.

[4] M.G. Crandall, H. Ishii, and P.-L. Lions *User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) Vol. 27 (1992), 1–67.

[5] M. G. Crandall, M. Kocan, and A. Święch, *L^p-theory for fully nonlinear uniformly parabolic equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, Vol. 25 (2000), No. 11-12, 1997–2053.

[6] H. Ishii, *On uniqueness and existence of viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear second order elliptic PDE's*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., Vol. 42 (1989), 14–45.

[7] H. Ishii and P.-L. Lions, *Viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear second-order elliptic partial differential equations* J. Differential Equations, Vol. 83 (1990), No. 1, 26–78.

[8] R.R. Jensen, *The maximum principle for viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear second order partial differential equations*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., Vol. 101 (1988), No. 1, 1–27.

[9] R. Jensen and A. Święch, *Uniqueness and existence of maximal and minimal solutions of fully nonlinear elliptic PDE*, Comm. on Pure Appl. Analysis, Vol. 4 (2005), No. 1, 199–207.

[10] N. V. Krylov, *On the maximum principle for nonlinear parabolic and elliptic equations*, Izvestiya Akademii Nauk SSSR, seriya matematicheskaya Vol. 42 (1978), No. 5, 1050–1062 in Russian; English translation in Math. USSR Izvestija, Vol. 13 (1979), No. 2, 335–347.

[11] N. V. Krylov, *Nonlinear elliptic and parabolic equations of second order*, Nauka, Moscow, 1985 in Russian; English translation: Reidel, Dordrecht, 1987.

[12] N.V. Krylov, *On a representation of fully nonlinear elliptic operators in terms of pure second order derivatives and its applications*, Problemy Matemat. Analiza, Vol. 59, July 2011, p. 3–24 in Russian; English translation: Journal of Mathematical Sciences, New York, Vol. 177 (2011), No. 1, 1-26.

[13] N.V. Krylov, *On the existence of smooth solutions for fully nonlinear elliptic equations with measurable "coefficients" without convexity assumptions*, Methods and Applications of Analyis, Vol. 19 (2012), No. 2, 119–146.

[14] N.V. Krylov, *On $C^{1+\alpha}$ regularity of solutions of Isaacs parabolic equations with VMO coefficients*, Nonlinear Differential Equations and Applications, NoDEA, Vol. 21 (2014), No. 1, 63–85.

[15] N.V. Krylov, *On the rate of convergence of finite-difference approximations for elliptic Isaacs equations in smooth domains*, submitted to Comm. in PDEs, http://arxiv.org/abs/1402.0252

[16] H.-J, Kuo and N.S. Trudinger, *Discrete methods for fully nonlinear elliptic equations*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, Vol. 29 (1992), No. 1, 123–135.

[17] M.V. Safonov, *On the classical solution of Bellman's elliptic equations*, Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR, Vol. 278 (1984), 810–813 in Russian; English translation in: Soviet Math. Dokl. Vol. 30 (1984), 482–485.

[18] M.V. Safonov, *On the classical solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations of second order*, Izvestiya Akademii Nauk SSSR, seriya matematicheskaya, Vol. 52 (1988), No. 6, 1272–1287 in Russian; English translation in Math. USSR Izvestija, Vol. 33 (1989), No. 3, 597–612.

[19] A. Święch, *$W^{1,p}$-interior estimates for solutions of fully nonlinear, uniformly elliptic equations*, Adv. Differential Equations, Vol. 2 (1997), No. 6, 1005–1027.

[20] N.S. Trudinger, *Comparison principles and pointwise estimates for viscosity solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana, Vol. 4 (1988), No. 3–4, 453–468.

[21] N.S. Trudinger, *On regularity and existence of viscosity solutions of nonlinear second order, elliptic equations*, Partial differential equations and the calculus of variations, Vol. II, 939–957, Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl., Vol. 2, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1989.

[22] O. Turanova, *Error estimates for approximations of nonhomogeneous nonlinear uniformly elliptic equations*, arXiv:1309.4343.

[23] N. Winter, *$W^{2,p}$ and $W^{1,p}$-estimates at the boundary for solutions of fully nonlinear, uniformly elliptic equations*, Z. Anal. Anwend., Vol. 28 (2009), No. 2, 129–164.

E-mail address: krylov@math.umn.edu

127 Vincent Hall, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, 55455